



ERIC GIBSON
DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu

April 29, 2010

Updated CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04 and updates)

1. Title; Project Numbers; Environmental Log Number:

Warner Ranch: (3810 06-002) SP06-002, GPA06-009, R06-011, VTM5508RPL³,
ER#06-02-020

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact David Sibbet, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3091
c. E-mail: david.sibbet@sdcounty.ca.gov

4. Project location:

The project site is located in the northwestern portion of the County approximately 5 miles east of Interstate 15 on Pala Road (State Route 76) (SR76) and west of Pala Temecula Road in the Pala Pauma Subregional Planning Area within unincorporated San Diego County. Thomas Brothers Page 1029, Grid F/3 and 4; G/3 and 4

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Ali Shapouri, PO Box 676221, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan: Pala/Pauma Subregional Plan
Land Use Designation: (18) Multiple Rural Use and (19) Intensive Agriculture
Density: 1 du/2 and 4 acres
Proposed Designation: (21) Specific Plan Area
Proposed Density: 2.33 du/acre

7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A70 Limited Agriculture & A72 General Agriculture
Minimum Lot Size: 2 acres
Special Area Regulation: Generally none; Floodplain over small portion.
Proposed: S-88 Specific Plan (1.52)
Proposed Minimum Lot Size: 2,937 sf

8. Description of project :

The project is an amendment of the General Plan, a Specific Plan, a Rezone and a Vesting Tentative Map to develop 513.6 acres including 780 residential units (556 single family detached and 224 multi-family and attached town homes), 10.8 acres of private community parks including a clubhouse, 5.5 acres of landscape areas, an 8.0-acre public active recreational park and 344.2 acres of preserved open space. The site is subject to the General Plan 1.3 Estate Development Area (EDA) Regional Category, Land Use Designation (18) Multiple Rural Use and (19) Intensive Agriculture. Zoning for the site is A70 Limited Agriculture and A72 General Agriculture Uses. The project proposes a Specific Plan and associated General Plan Category change to 21 and zoning change to S88 with a 1.52 dwelling unit per acre density. Access would be provided by SR76 and an onsite network of private roads. The development area currently is not within water, sewer, or fire service districts; a portion of the site is within the Rainbow Municipal Water District (RMWD) but that district is not willing to serve the development. De-annexation from the RMWD and annexation to the Yuima Water District is proposed. A modification of the County Water Authority boundary would also be required. Expansion of sewer and water treatment and distribution systems would be required. Two water reservoir tanks are proposed in the northeastern portion of the site and a connection to a major water line that is proposed in the vicinity of the northern boundary of the property. Annexation to the North County Fire District is also proposed. The project is currently partially within the North County Fire Protection District and entirely within the District's sphere of influence. A secondary access road would link the proposed project to Pala Temecula Road with a 25-foot wide roadbed and fuel modification and would be aligned along an existing dirt road traveling through the northeastern portion of the project site to Pala Temecula Road. In addition, fuel modification will be proposed adjacent to the development areas which will remain outside the biological open space preserve. Earthwork quantities for the onsite development will consist of approximately 3.4 million cubic yards (MCY) of cut and 3.4 MCY of fill. The project will include offsite improvements to segments of SR76 and along the frontage of the project site, and may include water and sewer service facility improvements including pipeline conveyance systems. The project proposes to be implemented in phases. (APNs: 110-021-09, -10; 110-090-01, -17, -18; 110-021-32; 110-040-22)

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The surrounding area consists of rural residential, agriculture, and Native American Reservation with agriculture, residential and casino. SR76 (Pala Road) forms the southern boundary of the project site; the Reservation forms the majority of the eastern, northern, and southern boundaries of the project site; and there are several rural residences and vacant land in unincorporated land to the west. Elevation on the project site ranges from 980 feet above mean sea level to 1175 feet in the northern portion of the site. The project site was a working horse ranch with an estate, guesthouse, avocado and citrus groves and vacant natural land. Several drainages occur on the project site with the Gomez Creek being most prominent. The site drains to the San Luis Rey River to the south. Large boulders and rock outcrops occur on hillsides; the San Luis Rey floodplain and associated areas have been farmed for many years. The vegetation onsite consists of chaparral, coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, riparian woodland, grassland, developed land, and agricultural fields. The eastern and northern portions of the property are predominately covered by chaparral and coastal sage scrub with the southwestern portion of the project area being farmed. The property includes houses, barns, arenas, stables, guesthouse (motel style), and several outbuildings (located in the southwestern and central portions of the property). The site currently has two access roads, both from SR76.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Administrative Permit Entry	County of San Diego
General Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
Road Opening	County of San Diego
Road Vacation	County of San Diego
Specific Plan	County of San Diego
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Remandment of Relinquished Access Rights	County of San Diego
Underground Storage Tank Permit	County of San Diego

Annexation to a City or Special District	Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
State Highway Encroachment Permit	CALTRANS
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Endangered Species Act Section 7 - Consultation or Section 10a Permit	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Stormwater Permit	RWQCB
Waste Discharge Requirements Permit	RWQCB
Water District Approvals	Yuima and Rainbow Water Districts
Sewer District Approval	Yuima Water District
Fire District Approval	North County Fire District
County Water Authority Approval	County Water Authority

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or a “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

April 29, 2010

Signature

Date

David Sibbet
Printed Name

Land Use/Environmental Planner III
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways. Based on a site visit completed by Maggie Loy on 9-20-2006 and David Sibbet on 2-1-10, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a designated scenic vista. The area is generally rural with horizon views of rugged mountains and a major valley and river. Portions of the valley are intensely developed in agriculture and industrial (mining) uses.

However, the project will change the composition of the view for drivers on SR76. The project site is located north of the San Luis Rey River and in the rugged foothills on the south flanks of Mount Olympus approximately 1.5 miles north of the site. The Tourmaline Queen Mountain is approximately 2 miles to the northeast of the site. Wilderness Gardens is the closest recreational destination and it is about 3 miles to the east of the site. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within these viewsheds, including the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista consists of rugged mountains and the San Luis Rey River.

The proposed project is a 780 unit residential development. A technical study must address the existing visual environment and the proposed change in terms of visual character and quality for drivers on SR76. Cumulative impacts and visual impacts from project proposed improvements to the highway should also be addressed.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from Caltrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. Based on a site visit completed by Maggie Loy on 9-20-2006 the proposed project is not located near or visible within the same composite viewshed as a State scenic highway and will not change the visual composition of an existing scenic resource within a State scenic highway. Generally, the area defined within a State

scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The project site is located north of the SR76 and the current view is to the rugged foothills on the southern flanks of Mount Olympus, but this highway is not designated as scenic. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as rural with sporadic residences and agricultural uses, and Native American land with a casino and residential community. The project will modify the onsite views from a rural farm to that of a planned residential community. The project may not be compatible with the existing visual environment's character and quality because it will consist of a land use that is different from that surrounding the project site. Therefore a technical study must address the existing visual character and proposed change and determine whether there are significant impacts to visual quality.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone A as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, about 12 miles west of the Palomar Observatory. The project is required to conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the Zone A lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, San Diego Gas and Electric land use planners, personnel from Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to address and minimize the impact of new sources of light pollution on

nighttime views. The standards in the Code establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits generally ensures that projects in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects do not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

However, the project does propose a General Plan Amendment that would allow more development in the area of concern for the Palomar Observatory and the project is adjacent to Pala Indian Reservation which is not regulated by County of San Diego codes or regulations. Therefore, a technical study must address the existing visual environment and the proposed change in terms of whether there would be a substantial new source of light that would cause a significant visual impact or contribute to significant cumulative impacts on the amount of outdoor lighting in Zone A.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site does contain lands designated as Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland, and is adjacent to land designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. In addition, the project contains Farmland of Local Importance. Because some of these lands will be converted to a non-agricultural use, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site has been actively farmed and is currently zoned A-70 and A-72, which are considered to be agricultural zones. While the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract, lands to the south and southwest

are under contract as agricultural preserve. Because the project does have the potential to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, and adjacent Williamson Act Contract lands, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site does contain lands designated as Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland, and is adjacent to land designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance. In addition, the project contains Farmland of Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Because some of these lands will be converted to a non-agricultural use, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves residential development at a density that is greater than what has been planned and therefore, the project could potentially conflict with the RAQS and the SIP. In addition, operation of the project may result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards of toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. Therefore, the project may conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) on a project or cumulative level. Because the project proposes greater urban density in a non-attainment area, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. For CEQA purposes, these screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which has stricter standards for emissions of ROCs/VOCs than San Diego's, is appropriate.

The project proposes construction and will result in residential traffic. While grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase may be substantial, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in approximately 7,000 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate more than 2,000 ADT are above the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria pollutants. As such, the project may violate air quality standards and may contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual

geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) and less than or equal to 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands. Sources of $PM_{2.5}$ primarily include construction vehicle diesel fuel particulates.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. While, the grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures, the emissions from the construction phase could be considerable, resulting in PM_{10} , $PM_{2.5}$, and VOC emissions above the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in about 7,000 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate more than 2,000 ADT are above the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: Banks Elementary School. An Air Quality Analysis will determine if the project would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and a site visit by County biologist Maggie Loy on 9-20-2006, the site and surrounding area supports native vegetation, namely, coastal sage scrub, chaparral, grasslands, pasture, and a variety of wetland and woodland types. A number of species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species have a high potential to occur. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a site visit by Maggie Loy on 9-20-2006, the site and surrounding area supports sensitive native vegetation, namely, coastal sage scrub, chaparral, annual grasslands/pasture, and a variety of wetland types. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on the site visit, it has been determined that the proposed project site contains several significant drainages, which if impacted may cause significant alterations to wetland habitats and/or watersheds that have been identified as California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers. In addition, the offsite road improvements could impact wetlands associated with the San Luis Rey River. Therefore a technical study must determine the significance of the impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Wildlife corridors potentially exist along natural drainages through various sensitive habitat types onsite, including: oak woodland, wetland habitats and coastal sage scrub. The project may potentially impact these corridors and may create additional indirect impacts through increased noise and activity. In addition, the site may contain a population of migratory fish. Therefore a technical study must determine the significance of the project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on the site visit, it has been determined that the proposed project may conflict with provisions of the Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) and will be subject to the County Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance. If a conflict with plans, policies, and ordinances that protect biological resources should occur, project alterations and mitigations would be required. Therefore, a technical study must determine the consistency with the NCCP and propose mitigation if necessary.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, it has been determined that the project may affect historical resources onsite or as part of proposed offsite improvements. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, it has been determined that the project site including the offsite improvement areas contains archaeological resources and therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☒ No Impact
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

No Impact: Unique Paleontological Resources - A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains.

Unique Geologic Features – The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan (see Appendix G for a listing of unique geological features) or support any known

geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. The Tourmaline Queen Mine is found approximately 2 miles to the east.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is not known to contain a cemetery but based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, it has been determined that the project site including the offsite road improvement area contains archaeological resources which may include interred human remains, and therefore potentially significant impacts to cultural resources could occur.

- e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is not known to contain a cemetery but based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, it has been determined that the project site including the offsite improvement areas contain archaeological resources which may include interred human remains. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: There is a fault that crosses the site. It is not an Alquist Priolo fault but it must be investigated to ensure that it is not active. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is located within 5 kilometers of the centerline of the Lake Elsinore fault zone as defined within the Uniform Building Code's Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements -- Chapter 16 Section 162- Earthquake Design as outlined within the California Building Code. Section 162 requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved by a County Structural Engineer before the issuance of a building or grading permit. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking from the as a result of this project.

There will also be an investigation of the onsite fault described above and if this fault is potentially active, there may be significant seismic shaking impacts in the proposed development area. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: There will also be an investigation of the onsite fault described above and if this fault is potentially active, there may be significant seismic related ground failure including liquefaction impacts in the proposed development area. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Slopes on site are significantly steep and have been noted as a "Landslide Susceptibility Area." A Geologic Investigation will be required to identify the location of geologic hazards that pose risk to people or property from landslides or rockfall and to provide engineering design measures to mitigate impacts.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils onsite are identified as Cieneba-Fallbrook, Las Posas, Visalia, Ramona, and Cieneba. All of these soils have a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The project does propose development of steep slopes which may increase erodibility. Due to these factors, a geologic report must determine the significance of project impacts and recommend procedures to avoid substantial soil erosion and loss of topsoil on a project level.

c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project area includes steep slopes, areas with soils that have a high potential for shrink/swell and areas with significant rock formations. In addition, there is a fault that crosses the site. Therefore, potentially significant impacts from geologic hazards could occur. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils onsite that have are listed as having a high potential for shrink swell soil include Las

Posas stony fine sandy loam (LrG and LrE). However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply with the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project is for 781 residential units on sewer. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

- b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant Impact: Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school and is on the site of historic agriculture which may have unrecorded underground storage tanks or hazardous substance spills that remain in the soil. However, the project will not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because all storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances will be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520.

The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of onsite. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations; to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release; and to suggest preventative measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project will not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. However, the project site does require additional investigation for identification and removal of Underground Storage Tanks (UST) and contamination from its historic agricultural use. If these hazards are discovered, appropriate disposal is required by law.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports; or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan for will not be interfered with because even though the project is located within a dam inundation zone, the project is not for a hospital, school, skilled nursing facility, retirement home, mental health care facility, care facility with patients that have disabilities, adult and childcare facility, jails/detention facilities, stadium, area, amphitheater, or similar use that may limit the ability of the County Office of Emergency Services to implement a dam evacuation plan.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. A Fire Protection Plan (FPP) is required to evaluate whether the project will expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The FPP will evaluate the project in conjunction with regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in Public Resources Code Sections 4290 and 4291. The site is currently in an area not served by a Fire Protection District. Annexation to the North County Fire District is required and an acceptable FPP is required prior to determining whether significant impacts from fire hazards would be mitigated.

- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site has supported equestrian uses that produce or collect animal waste; these uses are not proposed as a part of the project. The project does not involve or propose uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by County staff there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project is not expected to increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes 781 residential dwellings and amenities which requires NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. The project applicant will be required to provide evidence that application has been made to the SDRWQCB for coverage under the appropriate permit(s). For example, Report of Waste Discharge for a waste-discharge permit, Notice of Intent for either a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction. The project applicant must submit approved a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification which demonstrates that the project will comply with permit requirements.

The project will be required to implement the site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to

Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the Pala hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit, tributary to the following impaired waterbodies: Guajome Lake, Pacific Ocean shoreline, and San Luis Rey River. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, although the mouth of the San Luis Rey impaired for coliform bacteria, no portion of the San Luis Rey River, which is tributary to the Pacific Ocean, is impaired. Constituents of concern in the San Luis Rey River watershed include coliform bacteria, nitrate, sediment, and pesticides.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: Construction, landscaping, street sweeping, and residential uses. A Stormwater Management Plan will require site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters.

The BMPs will be consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by

project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Pala hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: parking lots and construction activities. However, site design measures and source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

In addition, BMPs will be consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to obtain its water supply from the Yuima Water District. The sources of water for the project have not been fully identified at this time. Based on the proposed use of groundwater for the project (if any), a groundwater study could be required. A Water Supply Assessment (WSA) and Verification is required for the project under California Water Code §10910-10915 (SB 610) and California Government Code § 66473.77 (SB 221). The WSA must address whether the water supplier's total projected water supplies (including groundwater) available during normal, single dry, and multiple dry water years during a 20-year projection will meet the projected demand of the proposed project, in addition to the water supplier's existing and planned future uses, including agricultural and manufacturing uses.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
☐ Mitigation Incorporated

Less than Significant Impact: The project is required by the Grading Ordinance and Watercourse Ordinance not to have adverse effects on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff. Also, the project cannot impair, impede or accelerate flow in any watercourse unless offsite permission is obtained from the potentially affected property owners. Based upon the project design shown on the tentative map, no significant change in the existing drainage patterns is anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Also, it is not anticipated that project will deposit any material in a watercourse, which may impair or impede the flow of water that would adversely impact adjoining property. As proposed the project includes the development of a privately maintained drainage channel that will collect surface water runoff from the project site to the existing drainage in the proposed open space lot. When final grading plans are submitted to the County of San Diego, the applicant will be required to meet the performance standards of the Grading and Watercourse ordinances by demonstrating that development on the project will not increase the amount of surface water runoff from pre-development levels. However, adequate discussion must be included in the

EIR and technical studies that demonstrates conformance with the Grading and Watercourse ordinances.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: The project is required by the Grading Ordinance and Watercourse Ordinance not to have adverse effects on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff. Also, the project cannot impair, impede or accelerate flow in any watercourse unless offsite permission is obtained from the potentially affected property owners. Based upon the project design shown on the tentative map, no significant change in the existing drainage patterns is anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Also, it is not anticipated that project will deposit any material in a watercourse, which may impair or impede the flow of water that would adversely impact adjoining property. As proposed the project includes the development of a privately maintained drainage channel that will collect surface water runoff from the project site to the existing drainage in the proposed open space lot. When final grading plans are submitted to the County of San Diego, the applicant will be required to meet the performance standards of the Grading and Watercourse ordinances by demonstrating that development on the project will not increase the amount of surface water runoff from pre-development levels. However, adequate discussion must be included in the EIR and technical studies that demonstrates conformance with the Grading and Watercourse ordinances.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is not anticipated to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. However, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, project impacts to existing or planned storm water drainage systems and proposed mitigation as appropriate must be analyzed in technical studies and as part of the EIR.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities and residential development. Site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable have not yet been identified. As a result, project impacts from storm water and proposed mitigation as appropriate must be analyzed in technical studies and as part of the EIR.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Drainages having a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site and floodplains mapped on FEMA Floodplain Maps and County Floodplain Maps for the San Luis Rey River affect or are adjacent to the offsite improvement locations. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary. However, the project is not proposing to place structures with a potential for human occupation within these areas. The technical study must address the location of access roads and offsite improvements for their potential to limit access during flood events or to affect downstream properties.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site contains drainage courses which are identified as being 100-year flood hazard areas. Design measures are expected to ensure that the project would not impede or redirect flood flows on site. However, flood hazard areas and design measures have not yet been identified. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary. In addition, it must address the location of access roads and offsite improvements for their potential to impede or redirect flood flows.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

- m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

- i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

- ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

- iii. MUDFLOW

Potentially Significant Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is located within a moderate to high landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore a Geotechnical Report is required to address conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity or exposed soils.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to introduce new services to an area that does not currently have them including a new water supply, wastewater disposal systems, and fire services. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of project impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Designations of (18) Multiple Rural Use and (19) Intensive Agriculture. The area is mostly the Estate Development Area (EDA) Regional Category, with a small portion of Environmentally Constrained (ECA) Regional Category in the south western portion of the site. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 4, 8, and 20 acres, with clustering on more level areas of large properties. The proposed project proposes a much higher density by requesting approval of a Specific Plan with an overall density of 1.52 acres per dwelling, with parcel sizes of approximately 3,000 square feet up to more than 7,000 square feet, with approximately 344 acres preserved as biological open space. Since the project proposes a concurrent re-zone from A70 & A72 (agricultural) to S88 (Specific Plan Area), density requirements and development regulations will be detailed in the requirements of the proposed Specific Plan's Land Use Element. A General Plan Amendment Report (GPAR) will address compliance with applicable land use plans and policies, including the policies of the Regional Land Use Element (RLUE) and Pala Pauma Subregional Plan. Because the project may have incompatibilities with the RLUE and the Subregional Plan, a technical study must determine the significance of potential land use impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Identified Mineral Resource Significance” MRZ-2. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of potential impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

No Impact: The project site is zoned A-70 and A72, which are not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is a residential subdivision adjacent to a state highway. Both onsite and offsite road improvements proposed as a part of the project may result in the exposure of people (existing and proposed residences) to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of potential impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project area is in excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or any facility where

quiet is an important attribute. SR76 has estimated noise contours that exceed CNEL 60 dB(A) on the property. This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). In addition, the Major Use Application indicates that three story multi-family residences with balconies are proposed that may be affected by noise from SR76. For the proposed single-family lots, noise may also be significant.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404

Non-transportation noise generated by the project may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line from uses including market, parks, clubhouse, pump station(?). The site is proposed as S88, Specific Plan zoning that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 decibels in the day and 45 at night. The adjacent properties are also zoned residential with the same one-hour average sound limits.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410

The project may generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). It must be determined whether drilling, blasting, or processing of materials will be required during construction operations and if these operations would exceed noise with an average sound level of 75dB (over 8 hours) between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM at any property line.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes residential land uses where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. The proposed residences are within 50 feet of the proposed State Route Right-of-Way and the development will be phased such that grading may be within 50 feet of completed phases of development. Groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels may be significant at these distances (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995). In addition, offsite SR76 improvements may affect offsite residences. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of potential impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: vehicles and construction equipment. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project may expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. A Noise Analysis is required to determine if the project would expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels in excess of that allowed by the County Noise Element. Therefore potentially significant noise impacts could occur.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a. and c., the project may expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Substantial temporary and periodic increases would also be expected. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of potential impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
---	---

☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☒ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels. If the Pala Casino expansion includes a private airstrip, then potentially significant noise impacts could occur.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project may induce substantial population growth in an area because the project would result in new and extended infrastructure, improved transportation facilities; new large-scale residential development; and regulatory changes including a General Plan amendment, a new specific plan and zone reclassifications, fire, sewer and water annexations with LAFCO annexation actions, in an area currently planned for Estate Residential development. Therefore, the project may remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in the area and create potentially significant population growth. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of potential impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact: The property was a ranch with guest houses, but it has been vacant for several years. The property currently has several caretakers in residence, but they are temporary residents and their displacement would not be a significant impact.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has several caretakers in residence, but they are temporary residents and their displacement would not be a significant impact.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of potential impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services are available to the project from Yuima Water District for sewer and water. A separate, project-specific Water Supply Assessment and Verification Report is required to be completed by the District. A portion of the development area must also be annexed into the San Diego County Water Authority service area.

For fire protection services, the site is within the North County Fire Protection District's (NCFPD) Sphere of Influence but the facility availability form indicates that facilities are not reasonably expected to be available within the next 5 years. However, the NCFPD is working on an expansion that would include this site. A fire station is under construction at the new power plant about a mile west of the site. Additional coordination will be required to determine if this facility will be adequate to serve the project.

For law enforcement, the County Sheriff's Department would provide services to the Warner Ranch site from their existing Pauma/Valley Center Substation, located

approximately 15 miles to the southeast. Additional coordination will be required to determine if the Sheriff's Department personnel from this substation can adequately serve the project or if the project would cumulatively impact Sheriff-services in the area.

For education, appropriate fees will be paid to the Bonsall Elementary School District and Fallbrook Union High School District in accordance with Education Code Section 17620. The Warner Ranch site is currently within both districts, which provide children with the options to attend Bonsall Elementary (about 12 miles southwest), Vivian Banks Charter School (about 0.5 miles east), Sullivan Middle School (about 10 miles southwest) and Fallbrook High School (about 15 miles west).

For recreation, the area is currently underserved and the County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation has requested that the project should provide public recreational facilities.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves a major residential subdivision that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the Department of Parks and Recreation has requested that the project include a 10 acre community park, pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The project proposes a public park as part of the project. Additional coordination will be required to determine if the public park will be adequate to serve the area and its PLDO contribution.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
--	---

☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves new recreational facilities. The proposal for new facilities must be evaluated to determine whether they will result in adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposal may result in a degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity. A traffic impact analysis must assess potentially significant impacts related to traffic volumes and road capacity. The traffic impact analysis should address ADTs generated by the project, impacts, if any, on the level of service of affected County roads, and proposed mitigation measures. The results of the traffic technical study should also be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The addition of traffic from 780 residences and park may result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity. A traffic impact analysis must be prepared for the proposed project to address all potentially significant traffic impacts related to the development of the proposed project including direct and cumulative impacts. The traffic impact analysis must assess all potentially significant impacts related to traffic volumes and road capacity. The traffic impact analysis should address ADTs generated by the project, impacts on the level of service of affected County roads, and proposed mitigation measures. The results of the traffic technical study should also be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed improvement areas on SR76 will likely require certain waivers from County road standards due to physical constraints. These improvements are likely to improve traffic safety (e.g., capacity, sight distance, curve radii). However, safety details must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: The project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County; therefore, the project has adequate emergency access.

- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The Zoning Ordinance Section 6766 Parking Schedule requires provision for onsite parking spaces based upon the maximum number of persons permitted to occupy the premise. The project must include adequate parking for the residences, the market, the private park, and the public park. The traffic study and EIR must discuss the number of spaces that are proposed and

determine if it is consistent with the requirements of the Parking Schedule. Therefore, the traffic study must determine the significance of potential impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project including offsite improvements to SR76 must be evaluated for potential hazards and barriers for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, elements supporting alternative transportation should be included. The traffic study and EIR must discuss the ways to support alternative transportation and determine if the project is consistent with requirements related to alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that has not been permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) at this time. While a project facility availability form has been received from the Yuima Water District that indicates the district will serve the project, the facilities to serve the project have not been approved or built. Therefore, it is not known if the project will be discharging wastewater to a RWQCB permitted community sewer system or if the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, including the Regional Basin Plan. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of potential impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project new or expanded water and wastewater treatment facilities are required. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services will be available to the project from the Yuima Water District. However, sufficient information is not available at this time regarding the necessary facilities and, therefore, the associated environmental effects cannot be assessed. Thus, they must be addressed in the EIR.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project will involve new and/or expanded storm water drainage facilities. However, sufficient information is not available at this time regarding the necessary facilities and, therefore, the associated environmental effects cannot be assessed. Thus, they must be addressed in the EIR.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, new water entitlements and resources are required. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate that water will be available to the project from the Yuima Water District. Pursuant to the district's service availability form, new water facilities must be constructed. A Water Supply Assessment (WSA) and Verification is required for the project under California Water Code §10910-10915 (SB 610) and California Government Code § 66473.77 (SB 221). The WSA must address whether the water supplier's total projected water supplies (including groundwater) available during normal, single dry, and multiple dry water years during a 20-year projection will meet the projected demand of the proposed project, in addition to the water supplier's existing and planned future uses, including agricultural and manufacturing uses. Therefore, a technical study must determine the significance of potential impacts and propose mitigation if necessary.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
--	---

☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities are required. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services will be available to the project from the Yuima Water District. Pursuant to the district's service availability form, new wastewater treatment facilities must be constructed. However, sufficient information is not available at this time regarding whether the necessary facilities will be available and, therefore, this must be addressed in the EIR.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ Potentially Significant Unless ☐ No Impact
Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). However, sufficient information is not available at this time regarding the necessary onsite recycling facilities required for compliance with applicable regulations and, therefore, this issue must be addressed in the EIR.

XVII.GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact:

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region¹ identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

According to the San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory (2008), the region must reduce its GHG emissions by 33 percent from "business-as-usual" emissions to achieve 1990 emissions levels by the year 2020. "Business-as-usual" refers to the 2020 emissions that would have occurred in the absence of the mandated reductions.

¹ San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory: An Analysis of Regional Emissions and Strategies to Achieve AB 32 Targets. University of San Diego and the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), September 2008.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. Development of regional targets is underway and SANDAG is in the process of preparing the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which will be a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy will identify how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

In addressing the potential for a project to generate GHG emissions that would have a potentially significant cumulative effect on the environment, a 900 metric ton threshold was selected to identify those projects that would be required to calculate emissions and implement mitigation measures to reduce a potentially significant impact. The 900 metric ton screening threshold is based on a threshold included in the CAPCOA white paper² that covers methods for addressing greenhouse gas emissions under CEQA. The CAPCOA white paper references the 900 metric ton guideline as a conservative threshold for requiring further analysis and mitigation. The 900 metric ton threshold was based on a review of data from four diverse cities (Los Angeles in southern California and Pleasanton, Dublin, and Livermore in northern California) to identify the threshold that would capture at least 90% of the residential units or office space on the pending applications list. This threshold will require a substantial portion of future development to minimize GHG emissions to ensure implementation of AB 32 targets is not impeded. By ensuring that projects that generate more than 900 metric tons of GHG implement mitigation measures to reduce emissions, it is expected that a majority of future development will contribute to emission reduction goals that will assist the region in meeting its GHG reduction targets.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) states that an EIR shall analyze greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

The project is the development of a specific plan for 780 residential units and private and public park amenities. It expected to generate on the order of 15 times the significance threshold of 900 metric tons of GHG emissions based on estimates of GHG

² See CAPCOA White Paper : "CEQA & Climate Change: *Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act*" January 2008 (<http://www.capcoa.org/rokdownloads/CEQA/CAPCOA%20White%20Paper.pdf>).

emissions for various project types included in the CAPCOA white paper³. Emissions from the project will be generated from construction, vehicle trips, water consumption, waste generation and disposal, and residential fuel combustion. Therefore, a technical study must analyze the GHG emissions that would be generated by the project and determine the significance of the change and propose mitigation if necessary.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact:

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. Development of regional targets is underway and SANDAG is in the process of preparing the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which will be a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy will identify how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The County of San Diego is currently in the process of updating its General Plan and incorporating associated climate change policies. These policies will provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

³ 900 metric tons of GHG emissions are estimated to be generated by 50 Single Family Residential units, 70 apartments/condos, 35,000 sf of general commercial/office, 11,000 sf of retail, or 6,300 sf of supermarket/grocery space.

Until local plans are developed to address greenhouse gas emissions, such as a local Sustainable Communities Strategy and updated General Plan Policies, the project is evaluated to determine whether it would impede the implementation of AB 32 GHG reduction targets. For the reasons discussed in the response to question a, above), a technical study must analyze the GHG emissions that would be generated by the project and determine the significance of the increase in GHG emissions and evaluate whether the project would impede the implementation of AB 32 reduction targets.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. As a result of this evaluation, the project was determined to have potential significant effects related to Biological Resources and Cultural Resources because technical studies addressing these topics have not been completed and mitigation measures have not yet been identified. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects related to Aesthetics, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, and Transportation and Traffic. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ((www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. Onsite Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.